

High-Energy Resummation in Di-hadron Production at the LHC

Francesco G. Celiberto,^{1,2} Dmitry Yu. Ivanov,^{3,4}

Beatrice Murdaca,² and Alessandro Papa^{1,2}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università della Calabria*

I-87036 Arcavacata di Rende, Cosenza, Italy

²*INFN - Gruppo collegato di Cosenza,*

I-87036 Arcavacata di Rende, Cosenza, Italy

³*Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia*

⁴*Novosibirsk State University, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia*

Abstract

We propose to study at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) the inclusive production of a pair of hadrons (a “di-hadron” system) in a kinematics where two detected hadrons with high transverse momenta are separated by a large interval of rapidity. This process has much in common with the widely discussed Mueller-Navelet jet production and can also be used to access the dynamics of hard proton-parton interactions in the Regge limit. For both processes large contributions enhanced by logarithms of energy can be resummed in perturbation theory within the Balitsky-Fadin-Kuraev-Lipatov (BFKL) formalism with next-to-leading logarithmic accuracy (NLA). The experimental study of di-hadron production would provide with an additional clear channel to test the BFKL dynamics. We present here the first theoretical predictions for cross sections and azimuthal angle correlations of the di-hadrons produced with LHC kinematics.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Bx, 12.38.-t, 12.38.Cy, 11.10.Gh

INTRODUCTION

The record energy of proton-proton collisions and the high luminosity of LHC provide us with a unique opportunity to study the dynamics of strong interactions in a kinematic range so far unexplored. The production of two, the most forward and backward, jets, separated by a large interval of rapidity, was proposed by Mueller and Navelet [1] as a tool to access the dynamics of semihard parton interactions at a hadron collider. In theory such processes are described using the BFKL method [2], which allows to resum to all orders the leading (LLA) and the next-to-leading terms (NLA) of the QCD perturbative series that are enhanced by powers of large energy logarithms. For the Mueller-Navelet jet production, the BFKL resummation with NLA accuracy relies on the combination of two ingredients: the NLA Green's function of the BFKL equation [3, 4] and the NLA jet vertices [5–9]. In [10–20], NLA BFKL calculations of the cross sections for the Mueller-Navelet jet process and also predictions for the jet azimuthal angle correlations, observables earlier suggested in [21, 22], can be found. Recently [23], the first measurements of the azimuthal correlation of the Mueller-Navelet jets at LHC were presented by the CMS Collaboration at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. Further experimental studies of the Mueller-Navelet jets at higher LHC energies and larger rapidity separations are expected.

The important task of revealing the dynamical mechanisms behind partonic interactions in the Regge limit, $s \gg |t|$, by the comparison of theory predictions with data, can be better accomplished if some other observables, sensitive to the BFKL dynamics, are considered in the context of the LHC physics program. An interesting option, the detection of three jets and four jets, well separated in rapidity from each other, was recently suggested in [24] and in [25].

In this letter we want to suggest a novel possibility, *i.e.* the inclusive di-hadron production

$$p(p_1) + p(p_2) \rightarrow h_1(k_1) + h_2(k_2) + X, \quad (1)$$

when the two detected hadrons have high transverse momenta and are separated by a large interval of rapidity. For this process, similarly to the Mueller-Navelet jet production, the BFKL resummation in the NLA is feasible, since the necessary item beyond the NLA BFKL Green's functions, *i.e.* the vertex describing the production of an identified hadron, was obtained with NLA in [26]. It was shown there that, after renormalization of the QCD coupling and the ensuing removal of the ultraviolet divergences, soft and virtual infrared

divergences cancel each other, whereas the surviving infrared collinear ones are compensated by the collinear counterterms related with the renormalization of parton densities (PDFs) for the initial proton and parton fragmentation functions (FFs) describing the detected hadron in the final state within collinear factorization. All the theoretical requisites are thus fulfilled to write down infrared-safe NLA predictions, thus making of this process an additional clear channel to test the BFKL dynamics at the LHC. The fact that hadrons can be detected at the LHC at much smaller values of the transverse momentum than jets, allows to explore a kinematic range outside the reach of the Mueller-Navelet channel, so that the reaction (1) can be considered complementary to Mueller-Navelet jet production, although sharing with it the theoretical framework.

We will give below the very first predictions for the cross sections and azimuthal angle correlations of the process (1). We will limit ourselves to present the main formulas, so to guarantee the reproducibility of our results, and postpone a more detailed account about their derivation to a later publication.

It is known that the inclusion of NLA terms makes a very large effect on the theory predictions for the Mueller-Navelet jet cross sections and the jet azimuthal angle distributions. Similar features are expected also for our case of inclusive di-hadron production. This results in a large dependence of predictions on the choice of the renormalization scale μ_R and the factorization scale μ_F . Here we will take them equal, $\mu_R = \mu_F$, and adopt the Brodsky-Lepage-Mackenzie (BLM) scheme [27] for the renormalization scale setting. In BLM the renormalization scale ambiguity is eliminated by absorbing the non-conformal, proportional to the QCD β_0 -function, terms into the running coupling. Such approach was successfully used, first in [14], for a satisfactory description of the LHC data on the azimuthal correlations of Mueller-Navelet jets [23], obtained by the CMS collaboration.

BFKL WITH BLM OPTIMIZATION

We consider the production, in high-energy proton-proton collisions, of a pair of identified hadrons with large transverse momenta, $\vec{k}_1^2 \sim \vec{k}_2^2 \gg \Lambda_{QCD}^2$ and large separation in rapidity.

In collinear factorization we neglect power-suppressed contributions, therefore the proton mass can be taken vanishing and the Sudakov vectors can be chosen to coincide with the proton momenta p_1 and p_2 , satisfying $p_1^2 = p_2^2 = 0$ and $2p_1 \cdot p_2 = s$. Then, the momentum

of each identified hadron can be decomposed as

$$k_{1,2} = \alpha_{1,2} p_{1,2} + \frac{\vec{k}_{1,2}^2}{\alpha_{1,2} s} p_{2,1} + k_{1,2\perp}, \quad k_{1,2\perp}^2 = -\vec{k}_{1,2}^2. \quad (2)$$

In the center-of-mass system, the longitudinal fractions $\alpha_{1,2}$ are related to the hadron rapidities by $y_1 = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\alpha_1^2 s}{\vec{k}_1^2}$ and $y_2 = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\vec{k}_2^2}{\alpha_2^2 s}$, which imply $dy_1 = \frac{d\alpha_1}{\alpha_1}$ and $dy_2 = -\frac{d\alpha_2}{\alpha_2}$, if the space part of the four-vector p_1 is taken positive. The differential cross section of the process (1) can be written as follows:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dy_1 dy_2 d|\vec{k}_1| d|\vec{k}_2| d\phi_1 d\phi_2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \left[\mathcal{C}_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2 \cos(n\phi) \mathcal{C}_n \right], \quad (3)$$

where $\phi = \phi_1 - \phi_2 - \pi$, with $\phi_{1,2}$ the two hadrons' azimuthal angles, while $y_{1,2}$ and $\vec{k}_{1,2}$ are their rapidities and transverse momenta, respectively. The eigenvalues of the kernel of the BFKL equation and the expressions for the hadron vertices are needed to calculate this cross section. In LLA the BFKL eigenvalues, parameterized by the continuous ν variable and the integer conformal spin parameter n , read

$$\chi(n, \nu) = 2\psi(1) - \psi\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + i\nu\right) - \psi\left(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - i\nu\right),$$

and the LLA hadron vertices,

$$c_1(n, \nu, |\vec{k}_1|, \alpha_1) = \frac{4}{3} (\vec{k}_1^2)^{i\nu-1/2} \int_{\alpha_1}^1 \frac{dx}{x} \left(\frac{x}{\alpha_1} \right)^{2i\nu-1} \left[\frac{C_A}{C_F} f_g(x) D_g^h\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{x}\right) + \sum_{a=q, \bar{q}} f_a(x) D_a^h\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{x}\right) \right], \quad (4)$$

$$c_2(n, \nu, |\vec{k}_2|, \alpha_2) = \left[c_1(n, \nu, |\vec{k}_2|, \alpha_2) \right]^*, \quad (5)$$

are given as an integral in the parton fraction x , containing the PDFs of the gluon and of the different quark/antiquark flavors in the proton, and the FFs of the detected hadron (for more details, see [26]). It is known [28], that in the BLM approach applied to semihard processes, we need to perform a finite renormalization from the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ to the physical MOM scheme:

$$\alpha_s^{\overline{\text{MS}}} = \alpha_s^{\text{MOM}} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_s^{\text{MOM}}}{\pi} T \right), \quad (6)$$

with $T = T^\beta + T^{\text{conf}}$,

$$T^\beta = -\frac{\beta_0}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3} I \right), \quad (7)$$

$$T^{\text{conf}} = \frac{3}{8} \left[\frac{17}{2} I + \frac{3}{2} (I-1) \xi + \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} I \right) \xi^2 - \frac{1}{6} \xi^3 \right],$$

where $I = -2 \int_0^1 dx \frac{\ln(x)}{x^2-x+1} \simeq 2.3439$ and ξ is the gauge parameter of the MOM scheme, fixed at zero in the following. The optimal scale μ_R^{BLM} is the value of μ_R that makes the β_0 -dependent part in the expression for the observable of interest vanish. In [18] some of us showed that terms proportional to the QCD β_0 -function are present not only in the NLA BFKL kernel, but also in the expressions for the NLA vertices (called “impact factors” in the BFKL jargon). This leads to a non-universality of the BLM scale and to its dependence on the energy of the process. It was also found [18] that contributions proportional to the NLA impact factors are universally expressed in terms of the LLA impact factors of the considered process, through the function $f(\nu)$, defined as follows:

$$i \frac{d}{d\nu} \ln \left(\frac{c_1}{c_2} \right) \equiv 2 \left[f(\nu) - \ln \left(|\vec{k}_1| |\vec{k}_2| \right) \right]. \quad (8)$$

Finally, the condition for the BLM scale setting was found to be

$$C_n^\beta \propto \int d(\text{P.S.}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu e^{Y \bar{\alpha}_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}) \chi(n, \nu)} c_1(n, \nu) c_2(n, \nu) \left[\frac{5}{3} + \ln \frac{(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}})^2}{|\vec{k}_1| |\vec{k}_2|} + f(\nu) - 2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{3} I \right) \right. \\ \left. + \bar{\alpha}_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}) Y \frac{\chi(n, \nu)}{2} \left(-\frac{\chi(n, \nu)}{2} + \frac{5}{3} + \ln \frac{(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}})^2}{|\vec{k}_1| |\vec{k}_2|} + f(\nu) - 2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{3} I \right) \right) \right] = 0, \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_s = 3\alpha_s/\pi$; the first term in the r.h.s. of (9) originates from the NLA corrections to the hadron vertices and the second one from the NLA part of the kernel. Here Y is the rapidity separation of two detected hadrons, $Y = y_1 - y_2$. We consider the *coefficients* integrated over the phase space for two final state hadrons,

$$C_n = \int d(\text{P.S.}) \mathcal{C}_n(y_1, y_2, k_1, k_2), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\int d(\text{P.S.}) = \int_{k_{1,\min}}^{\infty} d|\vec{k}_1| \int_{k_{2,\min}}^{\infty} d|\vec{k}_2| \int_{y_{1,\min}}^{y_{1,\max}} dy_1 \int_{y_{2,\min}}^{y_{2,\max}} dy_2 \delta(y_1 - y_2 - Y). \quad (11)$$

For the integrations over rapidities we use the limits, $y_{1,\min} = -y_{2,\max} = -2.4$, $y_{1,\max} = -y_{2,\min} = 2.4$, that are typical for the identified hadron detection at LHC. As minimum transverse momenta we choose $k_{1,\min} = k_{2,\min} = 5$ GeV, which are also realistic values for the LHC. We observe that the minimum transverse momentum in the CMS analysis [23] of Mueller-Navelet jet production is much larger, $k_{\text{jet},\min} = 35$ GeV. In our calculations we use the PDF set MSTW 2008 NLO [29] with two different NLO parameterizations for hadron

FFs: AKK [30] and HKNS [31]. We considered also the DSS parametrization [32], but do not show the related results here, since they would be hardly distinguishable from those with the HKNS parametrization. In the results presented below we sum over the production of charged light hadrons: $\pi^\pm, K^\pm, p, \bar{p}$.




FIG. 1: BLM scales for the di-hadron production *versus* the rapidity interval Y for the two parametrizations of FFs and for all the observables considered in this work.




FIG. 2: Cross sections of the di-hadron production at LHC *versus* the rapidity interval Y for the two parametrizations of FFs considered in this work: a) $\sqrt{s}=7$ TeV, b) $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV. See the text for the definition of “natural” and “BLM” scales.

In order to find the values of the BLM scales, we introduce the ratios of the BLM to




FIG. 3: $\langle \cos \phi \rangle$, $\langle \cos 2\phi \rangle$ and $\langle \cos 3\phi \rangle$ for di-hadron production at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV for the two parametrizations of FFs considered in this work. See the text for the definition of “natural” and “BLM” scales.

the “natural” scale suggested by the kinematic of the process, $\mu_N = \sqrt{|\vec{k}_1||\vec{k}_2|}$, so that $m_R = \mu_R^{\text{BLM}}/\mu_N$, and look for the values of m_R such that Eq. (9) is satisfied. Results are presented in Fig. 1 as functions of Y for the first few values of n and for the two values of the LHC center-of-mass energy. Then we plug these scales into our expression for the integrated coefficients in the BLM scheme (for the derivation see [18]):

$$C_n = \int d(\text{P.S.}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu \frac{e^Y}{s} e^{Y\bar{\alpha}_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}) [\chi(n,\nu) + \bar{\alpha}_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}) (\bar{\chi}(n,\nu) + \frac{T^{\text{conf}}}{3} \chi(n,\nu))]} \quad (12)$$




FIG. 4: Cross sections and $\langle \cos \phi \rangle$, for di-hadron production at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and larger rapidity intervals Y .

$$\times (\alpha_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}))^2 c_1(n, \nu) c_2(n, \nu) \left[1 + \bar{\alpha}_s^{\text{MOM}}(\mu_R^{\text{BLM}}) \left\{ \frac{\bar{c}_1^{(1)}(n, \nu)}{c_1(n, \nu)} + \frac{\bar{c}_2^{(1)}(n, \nu)}{c_2(n, \nu)} + \frac{2T^{\text{conf}}}{3} \right\} \right].$$

The coefficient C_0 gives the total cross sections and the ratios $C_n/C_0 = \langle \cos(n\phi) \rangle$ determine the values of the mean cosines, or azimuthal correlations, of the produced hadrons. In Eq. (12), $\bar{\chi}(n, \nu)$ is the eigenvalue of NLA BFKL kernel [33] and its expression is given, *e.g.* in Eq. (23) of [12], whereas $\bar{c}_{1,2}^{(1)}$ are the NLA parts of the hadron vertices [26]. The evaluation of (12) requires a complicated 8-dimensional numerical integration (the expressions for $\bar{c}_{1,2}^{(1)}$ contain an additional longitudinal fraction integral in comparison to the formulas for the LLA vertices, given in (4) and (5)). Since the main aim of this work is to stress the potential relevance of the process we are proposing, rather than to give a full NLA prediction, we will present our first results neglecting the NLA parts of hadron vertices, *i.e.* putting $\bar{c}_{1,2}^{(1)} = 0$. This reduces the expression in the r.h.s. of Eq. (12) to a 6-dimensional integral, manageable of a numerical calculation by a FORTRAN code. In Fig. 2 we present results for total cross sections at two values of the center-of-mass LHC energy: $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Fig. 3 shows our predictions for the azimuthal correlations at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.

For comparison, we considered also larger values of Y , similar to those used in the CMS Mueller-Navelet jets analysis. In Fig. 4 we present the cross section, C_0 , and $\langle \cos \phi \rangle$ in this larger Y -interval, calculated at center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and with the other settings as in Fig. 3. These results may be of future reference for CMS, LHCb or other

experiments.

DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

We checked that in our numerical analysis the essential values of x are not too small, $x \sim [10^{-3} \div 10^{-2}]$, and even bigger in the case of the larger Y intervals presented in Fig. 4. This justifies our use of PDFs with the standard DGLAP evolution. Note that our process is not a low- x one, and similarly to the Mueller-Navelet jet production, we are dealing with a dilute partonic system. Therefore possible saturation effects are not important here, and the BFKL dynamics appears only through resummation effects in the hard scattering subprocesses, without influence on the PDFs evolution.

Our results are obtained using both the AKK and HKNS parameterizations for the hadron FFs. We see on Figs. 1 and 2 the sizeable difference between predictions in these two cases, which means that the FFs are not well constrained in the required kinematic region. In a similar range the difference between π^\pm and K^\pm AKK and HKNS FFs was discussed recently in [34]. Our calculation with the AKK FFs gives bigger cross sections, whereas the difference between AKK and HKNS in Fig. 3 is small, since the FFs uncertainties are largely cancelled in the coefficient ratios describing the azimuthal angle correlations. We do not present separate plots for azimuthal correlations at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV because we found that the difference between our predictions for these observables at two LHC energies, $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, is not larger than 3%.

The general features of our predictions for di-hadron production are rather similar to those obtained earlier for the Mueller-Navelet jet process. Although the BFKL resummation leads to the growth with energy of the partonic subprocess cross sections, the convolution of the latter with the proton PDFs makes the net effect of a decrease with Y of our predictions in Fig. 2. This is due to the fact that, at larger values of Y , PDFs are probed effectively at larger values of x , where they fall very fast. For the di-hadron azimuthal correlations we predict in Fig. 3 a decreasing behavior with Y . That originates from the increasing amount of hard undetected parton radiation in the final state allowed by the growth of the partonic subprocess energy. The values of the BLM scales we found are much larger than μ_N , the scale suggested by the kinematic of the process. For the BLM-to-natural scale ratios we obtain rather large numbers, $m_R \sim 35$. These values are larger than those obtained

previously for similar scale ratios in the case of the Mueller-Navelet jet production process. The difference may be attributed to the fact that, in the case of di-hadron production, we have an additional branching of the parton momenta (described by the detected hadron FFs), and typical transverse momenta of the partons participating in the hard scattering turn to be considerably larger than $|\vec{k}_{1,2}|$, the momenta of the hadrons detected in the final state. We found that typical value of the fragmentation fraction is $z = \alpha_h/x \sim 0.4$, which explains the main source of the difference between the values of the BLM scales in the case of di-jet and di-hadron production. Another source is related to the difference in the function $f(\nu)$, defined in (8), which appears in the expression for the jet- and hadron-vertex in these two reactions, and enters also the definition of the BLM scale: $f(\nu)$ is zero for the jets and non-zero in the di-hadron case.

Our predictions for di-hadron production calculated in LLA with the use of the natural scale μ_N and our NLA results obtained with the BLM scale setting are different: with NLA BLM we got much lower values of the cross sections, see Fig. 2, and considerably larger predictions for the $\langle \cos n\phi \rangle$, see Fig. 3. For comparison, in Figs. 2 and 3 we show our NLA BLM predictions together with the results we obtained in LLA, but using the large values of the scales as determined with the BLM setting. Plots of Figs. 2 and 3 show that the LLA results with BLM scales lie closer to the NLA BLM ones than LLA results with natural scales. The difference between NLA BLM and LLA with BLM scale predictions is due to the account of NLA corrections to the BFKL kernel in the former. In this paper we did not include the known results for the NLA corrections to the hadron vertices, therefore our NLA analysis is approximated. As the next stage, we plan to incorporate the terms $\bar{c}_{1,2}^{(1)}(n, \nu)$ in our numerical code. At present we can only rely on the experience gained with the analysis of the similar Mueller-Navelet jet production process, where it was shown that NLA effects coming from the corrections to the BFKL kernel and to the jet vertices are equally important. Therefore the difference between our incomplete NLA BLM and LLA with BLM scale results could be considered as a rough estimate of the uncertainty of the present analysis.

The rapidity range we focused on here, $Y \leq 4.8$, may look to be not large enough for the dominance of BFKL dynamics. But we see, however, that in this range there are large NLA BFKL corrections, thus indicating that the BFKL resummation is playing here a non-trivial role. To clarify the issue it would be very interesting to confront our predictions with

the results of fixed-order NLO DGLAP calculations. But this would require new numerical analysis in our semihard kinematic range, because the existing NLO DGLAP results cover the hard kinematic range for the energies of fixed target experiments, see for instance [35, 36].

In our calculation we adopted, somewhat arbitrarily, the limit $|\vec{k}_{1,2}| \geq 5$ GeV for hadron transverse momenta. With this choice we obtained large values of the process cross sections, presented in Fig. 2. This makes us confident that the inclusive production of two detected hadrons separated by large rapidity intervals could be considered in forthcoming analyses at the LHC.

Considering a region of lower hadron transverse momenta, say $|\vec{k}_{1,2}| \geq 2$ GeV, would lead to even larger values of the cross sections. But it should be noted that in our calculation we use the BFKL method together with leading-twist collinear factorization, which means that we are systematically neglecting power-suppressed corrections. Therefore, going to smaller transverse momenta we would enter a region where higher-twist effects must be important. The applicability border for our approach could be established either by comparing our predictions with future data or by confronting it with some other theoretical predictions which do include higher-twist effects. For the last point, one can consider an alternative, higher-twist production mechanism, related with multiparton interactions in QCD (for a review, see [37]). The double-parton scattering contribution to the Mueller-Navelet jet production was considered in the papers [17] and [38], using different approaches. It would be very interesting if similar estimates were done also for the case of di-hadron production.

In conclusion, we believe that, even within the approximation adopted in our calculation and the systematics uncertainties related with the scale setting procedure, we have provided enough evidence that the study of the di-hadron production can be successfully included in the program of future analyses at the LHC and can improve our knowledge about the dynamics of strong interactions in the Regge limit.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank G. Safronov and I. Khmelevskoi for stimulating and helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the RFBR-15-02-05868.

-
- [1] A.H. Mueller, H. Navelet, Nucl. Phys. B **282**, 727 (1987).
 - [2] V.S. Fadin, E. Kuraev, L. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **60**, 50 (1975); Sov. Phys. JETP **44**, 443 (1976); E. Kuraev, L. Lipatov, V.S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 199 (1977); I. Balitsky, L. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 822 (1978).
 - [3] V.S. Fadin, L.N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 127 (1998).
 - [4] M. Ciafaloni, G. Camici, Phys. Lett. B **430**, 349 (1998).
 - [5] J. Bartels, D. Colferai, G.P. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. C **24**, 83 (2002).
 - [6] J. Bartels, D. Colferai, G.P. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. **C29**, 235 (2003).
 - [7] F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa and A. Perri, JHEP **1202**, 101 (2012).
 - [8] D.Yu. Ivanov and A. Papa, JHEP **1205**, 086 (2012).
 - [9] D. Colferai and A. Niccoli, JHEP **1504**, 071 (2015).
 - [10] D. Colferai, F. Schwennsen, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, JHEP **1012**, 026 (2010).
 - [11] B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, JHEP **1305**, 096 (2013).
 - [12] F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. B **877**, 73 (2013).
 - [13] F. Caporale, B. Murdaca, A. Sabio Vera, C. Salas, Nucl. Phys. B **875**, 134 (2013).
 - [14] B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 082003 (2014).
 - [15] B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, Phys. Lett. B **738**, 311 (2014).
 - [16] F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, no. 10, 3084 (2014) [Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 11, 535 (2015)].
 - [17] B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 076002 (2015).
 - [18] F. Caporale, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 114009 (2015).
 - [19] F.G. Celiberto, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca, A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 292 (2015).
 - [20] F.G. Celiberto, D.Yu. Ivanov, B. Murdaca and A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 224 (2016).
 - [21] V. Del Duca, C.R. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 4510 (1994).
 - [22] W.J. Stirling, Nucl. Phys. B **423**, 56 (1994).
 - [23] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS) (2016), arXiv:1601.06713 [hep-ex].
 - [24] F. Caporale, G. Chachamis, B. Murdaca and A. Sabio Vera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 1, 012001 (2016).
 - [25] F. Caporale, F.G. Celiberto, G. Chachamis and A. Sabio Vera, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 3, 165

- (2016).
- [26] D.Yu. Ivanov, A. Papa, JHEP 07, 045 (2012).
 - [27] S.J. Brodsky, G.P. Lepage, P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 228 (1983).
 - [28] S.J. Brodsky, F. Hautmann, D.E. Soper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 803 (1997). [Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3544 (1997)]; Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6957 (1997); S.J. Brodsky, V.S. Fadin, V.T. Kim, L.N. Lipatov, G.B. Pivovarov, JETP Lett. **70**, 155 (1999); JETP Lett. **76**, 249 (2002).
 - [29] A. Martin, W. Stirling, R. Thorne, G. Watt, Eur. Phys. J. C **63**, 189 (2009).
 - [30] S. Albino, B.A. Kniehl and G. Kramer, Nucl. Phys. B **803**, 42 (2008).
 - [31] M. Hirai, S. Kumano, T.-H. Nagai and K. Sudoh, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 094009 (2007).
 - [32] D. de Florian, R. Sassot and M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 114010 (2007); Phys. Rev. D **76**, 074033 (2007).
 - [33] A.V. Kotikov and L.N. Lipatov, Nucl. Phys. B **582**, 19 (2000).
 - [34] D. J. Yang, F. J. Jiang, W. C. Chang, C. W. Kao and S. i. Nam, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 393 (2016).
 - [35] J. F. Owens, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 034011 (2002).
 - [36] L. G. Almeida, G. F. Sterman and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 074016 (2009).
 - [37] M. Diehl, D. Ostermeier and A. Schafer, JHEP **1203**, 089 (2012).
 - [38] R. Maciula and A. Szczurek, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 1, 014022 (2014).